1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
789	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10 11	WILLIAM ALLEN VANDERSLICE, Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 3:16-CV-05792-RSL-DWC
12 13 14	v. NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner of Social Security Administration,	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE Noting Date: March 24, 2017
15	Defendant.	
16	The District Court has referred this action, filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to United	
17	States Magistrate Judge David W. Christel. Plaintiff William Allen Vanderslice, proceeding <i>pro</i>	
18	se, filed this action on September 16, 2016. Dkt. 1. On December 6, 2016, Defendant filed an	
19	Answer to the Complaint. Dkt. 10. The Court issued a Scheduling Order ordering Plaintiff to file	
20 21	an opening brief by January 3, 2017. Dkt. 11. Th	e Court issued an Amended Scheduling order on
22		
23		
24		

1	January 4, 2017, ordering Plaintiff to file an opening brief by February 2, 2017. Dkt. 12.	
2	Plaintiff failed to file an opening brief by February 2, 2017. The Court then entered an Order to	
3	Show Cause on February 15, 2017, directing Plaintiff to file an opening brief by February 24,	
4	2017. Dkt. 13. The Court warned Plaintiff it would recommend dismissal of his case for failure	
5	to prosecute if Plaintiff failed to file an opening brief by February 24, 2017.	
6	Plaintiff has not filed an opening brief or otherwise responded to the Court's February 15,	
7	2017 Order. As Plaintiff has failed to file an opening brief and prosecute this case, the	
8	undersigned recommends the Court dismiss this case without prejudice.	
9	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil	
10	Procedure, the parties shall have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report to file written	
11	objections. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those	
12	objections for purposes of appeal. <i>Thomas v Arn</i> , 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time	
13	limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the Clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on March	
14	24, 2017, as noted in the caption.	
15	Dated this 3rd day of March, 2017.	
16	Ma Muisto	
17	David W. Christel	
18	United States Magistrate Judge	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	¹ The Court issued its Amended Scheduling Order due to the fact the original Scheduling Order was inadvertently not mailed to Plaintiff. The Amended Scheduling Order, however, was	
24	mailed to Plaintiff's address of record.	